

## New York Tribune.

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements.

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, Office 200 Broadway, New York City. Registered at Postoffice at New York, N. Y., as Second-Class Matter.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid.**  
 Outside of Greater New York: Daily, 5 mos. \$3.75; 1 year, \$7.00.  
 Daily & Sunday, 5 mos. \$4.25; 1 year, \$8.00.  
 Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$15.00.  
 Sunday only, 6 months, \$2.50; 1 year, \$4.50.

**FOREIGN RATES.**  
 Daily, 5 mos. \$4.25; 1 year, \$8.00.  
 Daily & Sunday, 5 mos. \$4.75; 1 year, \$9.00.  
 Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$16.00.  
 Sunday only, 6 months, \$2.75; 1 year, \$5.00.

**CANADIAN RATES.**  
 Daily, 5 mos. \$3.75; 1 year, \$7.00.  
 Daily & Sunday, 5 mos. \$4.25; 1 year, \$8.00.  
 Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$15.00.  
 Sunday only, 6 months, \$2.50; 1 year, \$4.50.

**ADVERTISING RATES.**  
 One month, \$1.00; 3 months, \$2.50; 6 months, \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00.  
 One month, \$1.00; 3 months, \$2.50; 6 months, \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00.  
 One month, \$1.00; 3 months, \$2.50; 6 months, \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00.

## No Direct Tax Necessary.

It must be a matter of genuine regret to every taxpayer of this town, to every tenement dweller, to every citizen, that Controller Prendergast permitted himself to be used, even to a limited extent, to cover up the blundering at Albany over state finances. What he has done, and he has done it deliberately, is to confuse every reader of the figures supplied by his experts by adding a mass of irrelevant and unessential details.

Fortunately this confusion can be abolished. By discarding every comment of the Controller and merely examining the figures it is possible to arrive at an accurate notion of how great was Governor Whitman's blunder and how unjust to this city is the policy of excessive taxation which he has adopted.

Controller Prendergast's experts have reported that at the end of this year there will be in the state treasury a surplus of \$3,300,000. Governor Whitman first forecast a deficit of \$18,000,000 and then modified it to \$10,000,000. The experts also estimate that at the end of 1916 there will be a deficit of \$5,300,000, unless a direct tax be levied, and \$5,300,000 is all that the Legislature has to provide for that year.

Assuredly it is real progress in a horizontal reduction of the tax rate to cut the levy from \$18,000,000 to \$5,300,000, and the saving to this city will be nearly \$8,000,000; but this is not all that can be done. Of the \$5,300,000 not less than \$4,000,000 is to be spent for canal improvement. Hitherto all such work has been made a capital charge, defrayed from bond issues. A change of public policy now is unwise, and the question should be submitted to the public this fall, as all other canal propositions have been.

There is left, then, less than \$2,000,000 as a prospective deficit for 1916. But Mr. Prendergast gives this city assurance that the Governor means to prune all appropriations to the bone, to impose new indirect taxes. Is it, then, unreasonable to suppose that the relatively insignificant prospective deficit, reduced in the Controller's figures from \$18,000,000 to less than a tenth of that sum, can be avoided by rigid economy?

Were this impracticable there remains a further possibility contributed by Mr. Prendergast himself. There is an excess of \$27,800,000 in the various sinking funds. If the Constitutional Convention should frame and the people at the fall election adopt an amendment permitting the state to abstain from contributions to the sinking fund until the excess had been absorbed, \$8,000,000 of the state revenues next year could be deflected to meet any possible deficit, and this would be sufficient to meet all possible deficit, even if the \$4,000,000 canal expenditure is permitted.

The simple truth, then, is that no direct tax is necessary for next year. All the Controller's talk about methods of state financing is beside the mark. For many, many years the state has followed the custom of permitting each Legislature to draw on the revenue of the current year for expenditures charged against the next. There is nothing new or essentially vicious in this. If the state were going out of business next year, then it would have to raise enough money to pay both the current year's expenditures and those of the next year, which have been anticipated. But the state is not going out of business, and therefore discussion of this detail is wholly irrelevant and deliberately intended to create confusion, under cover of which the Governor can escape the consequences of a ridiculous misstatement of the financial situation.

What is vital, what is essential for all the citizens of this community to recognize is that it has been proposed to levy upon them unnecessarily a direct tax of \$11,300,000. This levy has now been reduced under challenge to \$5,300,000; but this tax is also unnecessary, as the slightest examination of the official estimates proves. The opportunity to expose the whole blunder, if it is to be accepted as merely a blunder, came to Mr. Prendergast, and he failed to accept it. His statement, instead of exploding the whole plan, has merely created further confusion and left the real task to be performed by others.

Mayor Mitchell and President McAneny will unquestionably take up the fight on behalf of this city. But at Albany it should be made by Republican Senators and Assemblymen from Greater New York. For them, for the Republican party in this mu-

nicipality, the thing is vital. If an upstate Republican majority succeeds this year in jamming through an unjust and unnecessary tax levy, paid by New York City, Tammany Hall will acquire the necessary ammunition to resume its operations.

No other issue, no other proposal that will come before the Legislature is of greater importance to New York City than the direct tax project. The first challenge has compelled the reduction of the figures from \$18,000,000 to \$5,300,000. But the \$5,300,000 is unnecessary. There should be no direct tax this year, and there will be none if the Republican members of the Senate and Assembly from this city do their duty at Albany.

## Easy Spending and Hard Sledding.

A remarkable tribute has just been paid to the Wilson administration's efficiency as a spender. Representative John J. Fitzgerald, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and Representative Frederick H. Gillette, the leading minority member, agree that although Congress appropriated \$1,115,000,000 at the last session, it would have appropriated \$17,000,000 more if the administration's recommendations had been followed. In the field of governmental economy Mr. Wilson has made a sorry figure. He has never tried to eliminate waste in governmental operations. On the contrary, he has sought to keep the Democrats in Congress in line for his anti-business legislation by giving them a free hand.

As a consequence his first Congress has spent \$177,000,000 more than was spent by the last Republican Congress—that of 1909-11. If the Indian and Post Office appropriation bills had not failed at the last session the excess would have been \$189,000,000. Congress has imposed new internal revenue taxation to the amount of nearly \$100,000,000 a year. Yet because of waste and negligence current revenues are running far behind current outlay, and even Mr. Fitzgerald now estimates a Treasury deficit at the end of the fiscal year on June 30 next of \$103,000,000. This does not include a Panama Canal deficit of \$20,000,000.

The European war cannot be held responsible for this wretched showing. Extra taxes were levied to offset a shrinkage of customs revenues due to the war. The trouble was that Congress went ahead at the last session spending money on a scale unknown in the years before the war. It was this neglect of ordinary precautions in a time of straitened income that has brought the Treasury to its present condition of emptiness and exhaustion.

## Great Britain's Attack on Neutral Rights.

The British government issued yesterday its expected Order in Council interdicting commerce between neutral countries and Germany. The details of the order are of little consequence. Since Great Britain has undertaken to brush aside rights which neutrals enjoy under the existing code of international law it cannot matter very much whether the methods employed in making good that usurpation are in themselves high handed or are calculated to give as little technical inconvenience as possible to neutral sufferers.

The British government promises that the measures which it takes will involve no "risk to neutral ships or to neutral or non-combatant life" and will accord with "a strict observance of the dictates of humanity." But that is merely sugar-coating a bitter dose. No neutral nation can be any the less averse to surrendering its established rights on the high seas because the belligerent who is trying to take them away agrees to conduct hold-up operations in a more or less civil and considerate manner.

Great Britain's new programme is based on a theory which cannot be justified in law or in reason. The law of nations is an outgrowth of common conceptions of fairness in international dealings. It establishes restraints which are of universal benefit. It is a piece of arrogance for any one nation to hold that international understandings must yield in an emergency to its temporary self-interest. That is what Great Britain is doing in calling on neutral nations to suspend commerce with Germany, although Germany's ports are not blockaded and Great Britain declines to accept the military risks of blockading them. There is no reason why the United States or any other neutral nation should abandon the right to trade with Germany simply because a voluntary cessation of such trade would allow Great Britain and her allies to reap all the benefits of a legal blockade without incurring any of the inconveniences of maintaining one.

We are asked to participate, at least passively, in a punitive operation launched by one belligerent against another. We cannot any more submit to Great Britain's demand that we surrender our right to trade with unblockaded German ports or with Germany through neutral ports (subject, of course, to contraband restrictions) than we could have allowed ourselves to be intimidated by Germany's "war zone" threat into abandoning our trade with the unblockaded ports of Great Britain and Ireland.

The excuse given for the Order in Council is that it is a reprisal. That excuse may hold against Germany, but it cannot hold against neutrals. Just because Germany has sunk allied merchantmen and has intimated that her submarines might accidentally sink neutral merchantmen Great Britain is not justified in going still further and saying that neutral merchantmen may not hereafter carry any goods destined to Germany or outward bound from Germany.

If one combatant in a quarrel strikes out wildly at an innocent bystander, that does not warrant the other combatant in turning to and knocking the innocent victim out. What the belligerents do to one another does not directly concern us. But when either attacks us as an incident of

his warfare on the other we must defend ourselves. The United States would not be faithful to its honorable traditions as a champion of neutral interests if it did not protest with all its energy against the British Order in Council's flagrant subversion of international rights.

## Lincoln Beachey's Death.

What happened to Lincoln Beachey over San Francisco Bay was bound to happen to him. The detail that he might have come out alive had he not been strapped in so tightly or that his monoplane would not have crumpled had it been properly braced cannot alter the conclusion. Whether from carelessness or an excess of deliberate daring, a violent death for the circus aviator is practically inevitable.

It is this which makes his encouragement a social crime. To produce "thrills" he must take ever greater chances. No sooner has he mastered one convulsion than its staleness drives him to another, since nothing evaporates more quickly than public excitement over the same spectacle. Such mad progression can have no other end but death, untimely and spectacularly hideous.

And it is not alone the aviator who pays for this morbid fever which he shares with the public. Society pays, and pays dearly, in a number of ways. To begin with, it loses in the aviator a young and valuable member, whose daring and imagination might prove of great value if directed in legitimate channels. It loses, too, those who would emulate him, as Beachey himself pointed out in referring, two years ago, to the deaths of "Gene Ely, Horace Kearney, Charlie Walsh and others, who would dip or loop the loop or fly upside down or do any of a number of things of no lasting benefit to the world."

But society punished even more by the blow to the development of useful aviation which these catastrophes deal. And finally, the particular community or occasion responsible for a flight which results as Beachey's did suffers grievously from the repellent association.

"An end to daredevil flying," Mr. Howard Huntington, of the Aero Club of America, has called this latest tragedy. If only the shock of Lincoln Beachey's plunge might modify human nature sufficiently to make the prediction come true, then this nifty aviator had not died in vain.

## Italy's Decision.

The reasons for Italian participation in the Great War have been too frequently canvassed to have any novelty now. When Italy gained her unity in the last century, first with the aid of Napoleon III and then with that of Bismarck, two fragments of territory inhabited by Italians were left to Austria, the Trentino district of the Tyrol and the city of Trieste, with the shores of the Istrian Peninsula.

For every Italian patriot this *Italia irredenta* has been a humiliation for many years. Irritation at France over the seizure of Tunis by the republic in 1881 sent Italy into the Triple Alliance and for a generation postponed the Austro-Italian struggle for the Trentino.

But Austria and Italy were natural rivals in the Adriatic and in the Aegean. The annexation of Bosnia by Austria in 1908 awakened Italian apprehension. Austrian and Italian interests clashed in Albania, and the Dalmatian provinces of the Hapsburgs, old citadels of Venice, were included in the dream of a greater Italy.

In the last ten years France and Italy have drawn together. The old Tunis settlement, the older bitterness over French acquisitions of Nice—these have died out. Italian sympathies are naturally with the liberal powers, the old hatred of Austria, the old memories of the sufferings of the nineteenth century have proved stronger than more recent disputes.

Because of her lack of sympathy with her Austrian and German allies, Italy stayed out of the war in August. She seems now on the point of entering it, not because of any present occasion for hostility, but because Austrian weakness offers the opportunity to complete the work of 1866, when a similar Austrian disaster gave her a chance to regain Venetia.

In addition, Italy recognizes the approach of Turkey's ruin. Rome perceives that if Italy is to share in the new division of territories in the Aegean she must share in the labor. There is nothing very noble or inspiring in the Italian course. It is almost the exact repetition of Rumania's rôle in the second Balkan war, save that Rumania sought to enslave Bulgars, while Italy is honestly seeking to liberate some enslaved Italians.

Berlin, long foreseeing Italian action, sought first to win Italy as an ally by offering her British and French Mediterranean colonies. Failing, she then proposed to Austria the peaceful cession of the Trentino, but Austria seems in no mood for peaceful cession. Hence the present crisis has come. Italy may still get her price without fighting, but that possibility seems increasingly slight.

If Etter and Tannenbaum really want to see how what they preach works out in practice, they should head for Carranza and Zapata Mexico City.

Subway fires are becoming so frequent that in a few days the investigators, having had sufficient practice, may discover what causes them.

"Apologists of Ari Made by the Pound."—Headline.

Quantitative analysis, which is quite in accord with much business theory these days.

When in doubt take a whack at international law, seems to be the order of the day among the European belligerents.

Billy Sunday's collection proves that vaudeville methods pay better than the "legitimate" elsewhere than on the stage.

The du Pont employees, with their 20 per cent wage increase, probably fail to appreciate the horrors of war.

Maybe Mr. Wilson hopes before he gets out to show the country a Three Billion Dollar Congress.

Bank Wrecker Beating.—Headline.

His profession entails "hard labor."

WHITMAN—18,000,000.  
 PRENDERGAST—5,300,000.

## THE FREE EMPLOYMENT AGENCY

Reader Thinks It Must Help Those Otherwise Lacking Aid.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: I read in your issue of the 9th inst. a letter under the caption "Paying for Jobs." The writer suggests that the employment agency fee be reduced to 5 per cent. Assuming the domestic receives \$25 monthly with board and lodging, the agent receives \$2.50. Add to the wages the keep, and the position is worth about \$50 monthly. The class of agencies designated by your correspondent—those near Fifth Avenue—do not cater to applicants who are compelled to pawn their wearing apparel. Sixty per cent of the present unemployment and destitution is the result of alcoholism and lack of frugality. Domestic servants can well afford to pay the legal fee demanded. They are not looking for charity.

In many instances they are more independent than their employers. They would not patronize a municipal, state or federal agency more than a wealthy clubman would patronize a bawdy. A lawyer recently described in a court trial the domestics that frequent a high class agency as "bedraggled servants." There was no justification for his slur.

I think that your statement that the free employment agencies will supplant the private agencies is questionable. Free employment agencies have their functions, and one is to provide employment for those whom the private agencies cannot place and would not if they could. Employers for personal and human reasons prefer to patronize private agencies.

After all, what is the purpose of the "free employment bureau"? Is it to compete with private agencies, or to help those whom the private agencies cannot accommodate? The taxpayer is obliged to pay the fees of those who patronize the free employment agency.

CHARLES O'CONNOR IRWIN.  
 President United Employment Agents' Association.  
 New York, March 10, 1915.

## The Defenders.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: In your issue of March 9 Mr. Hornaday, quoting Ezekiel upon the sword at some length, says that as all disbelievers in organized murder are no doubt God-fearing folk Holy Writ must answer them.

Does Mr. Hornaday remember, or does he wish to emulate, that eminent personage who once quoted Scripture for his purposes during a temptation in the wilderness?

Or perhaps, when his eyes alight upon St. Paul's, "Slaves, obey your masters," he is so confident that all the God-fearing will advocate the cause of slavery?

Bishop Greer did his splendid duty as representative of the Prince of Peace. That an officer of the army should perceive the logical end of his occupation, the human abuses, is no doubt impossible. But the optimistic among us may still hope that John Stevenson, of an ordinance corporation in Pennsylvania—whom you quote to-day as refusing to make shells, believing it better to do "something useful" rather than to "make things to destroy mankind"—is a better representative of our citizenship, more disinterested, more courageous, than those who enroll themselves as the American Legion of "Defence."

SARAH WARDER MACCONNELL.  
 New York, March 10, 1915.

## How the Money Goes.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: I have been opposed to the purchase of the Williamsburg Trust Company Building at the Plaza of the Williamsburg Bridge by the City of New York. Recently, at the first vote taken whether this building should be purchased by the city, the Board of Aldermen voted the proposition down. At their next meeting there was a reconsideration of the resolution and it was then passed.

Several of the aldermen who voted against the purchase of the building at the first meeting voted at the second meeting in favor of the purchase.

This building is to be purchased by the city for \$60,000, and the building is not worth that amount, nor is it a proper place for a courthouse. The building proper is in a

very bad location, the condition is bad; it is too small and there are a large number of other objections.

The cry of the city to-day is that the City of New York has no funds, and that the City should expend \$60,000, considering its financial condition, is outrageous.

Recently the City of New York borrowed \$100,000,000 and paid 6 per cent for it.

CHARLES H. LEVY.  
 Brooklyn, March 11, 1915.

## REVISION DOWNWARD.

## IMMIGRATION AND ALIEN LABOR

The Source of Woes Unnumbered, Thinks This Reader.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: I have watched with intense interest your articles on this alien labor question. While there is no greater admirer of The Tribune's editorials than myself, I do not hesitate to let you know that I disagree with your sentiments on this most vital question.

How can a real, live American with any true sense of patriotism sit back and be glad that this alien labor bill has been repealed? In to-day's article entitled "Satisfactory to All" The Tribune says that this country invites immigration. Why, then, has there been repeated effort by men of real brains to introduce measures that would, if made laws, require a reasonable amount of intelligence from all foreigners before entry into the United States?

In what other city of the civilized world are the police confronted with such flagrant criminality as in New York City, and why? Because New York City is known all over the world as a nucleus for the degenerate ignoramus who is so void of any sense of education or morality that he can only earn his "livelihood" (if such it may be called) by selling cocaine, etc., by indulging in and encouraging "white slavery," by manufacturing and laying bombs and infernal machines, by starting incendiary fires for revenge and what I consider the worst, by blackmail, which includes kidnapping of innocent children from the streets.

Be honest to your readers and admit that the most dangerous criminals in this city today have come from foreign countries. Whether you admit it or not, Police Department statistics prove it. Yet this country encourages immigration and cares not if the immigrants be the scum of the earth, so long as they are healthy and not paupers.

The aforementioned article entitled "Satisfactory to All" says that the bill "provides that citizens must have preference over aliens in employment on public works, but relieves the contractors by permitting employment of aliens when citizens are not available."

Right there is the joker—"when citizens are not available." Do you or does any other intelligent man think that a contractor will employ a "citizen" and give a fair living wage when that same contractor can get carcasses of aliens or Hindus, as another of your readers has advised, who can't even speak English and who will work for half of what an American citizen will work for? Not on your life, and you know it.

The article further says: "It is not to be expected that they should be encouraged to seek citizenship from employment, but they certainly should have the chance to obtain employment where they merit it." Was there ever such rubbish? Who, I would like to know, is elected to decide this question? Mr. Contractor is the man, and he decides by hiring alien labor because citizen labor is not preferable and not available, as the bill jokingly states.

Why has the wage scale decreased during the last ten years as regards manual labor? Isn't it because alien labor can be had for half the price? Tell the truth about it.

But around election time our district captains and leaders don't care a rap about the population which doesn't vote. No, they are after the "citizens" who has a "vote." But he isn't given a job, is he? Very seldom.

The Chief Executive of this great and glorious nation vetoed the literacy test (and practically killed it) as harmful to American interests. Whose interests, I'd like to know? The same man will read almost daily of some hideous crime wrought at the hands of some foreigner and aimed at American people. Yet he maintains that immigration be encouraged in all branches without any more than the present restrictions.

The Tribune, the most progressive, the clearest, the most truthful and the only real live newspaper that is in truth devoted to the interests of "the people," upholds and commends our Chief Executive for his action as regards this literacy test, and likewise lines up with Governor Whitman in the repeal of the alien labor law.

As I am no fanatic, socialist or in any way demented, I am open to further conviction on either of these two subjects.

FRANCIS G. BAIER.  
 Brooklyn, March 11, 1915.

## Put Business Men on Guard.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: There seems to be reasonable certainty that the Public Service Commissioners will be removed "for the good of the service." Hardly a newspaper but advocates a change. It therefore behooves the Governor and Legislature to make competent business men and engineers and railroad a majority of the appointees. For why, as in the case of the present commission, be of the legal profession?

It is seldom that a lawyer, however proficient he may be in his profession, is a good business man. Certainly, he cannot lay tracks, install electric wires, build bridges—steel and steel ones, not political. Besides, all commissions have a staff of legal talent to advise them. Hence, put business men on the several commissions.

EDWIN BARRY WILCOX.  
 New York, March 10, 1915.

## The Camp Fire Girls' Revolt.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: The "revolt" of Camp Fire Girls, guardians and local bodies against the policies of the present administration in their organization is not without just cause and intelligent leading.

The "revolt" proves that too much ruling from "headquarters," without representation and counsel with the guardians, will not succeed in an organization that is supposed to exist for the welfare of all.

Most of the valuable and responsible work of the organization depends on the originality, inspiration and efficiency of the volunteer leaders, or, as they are known, guardians. They take up these responsibilities without compensation and carry out the ideals of the institution with little or no assistance from "headquarters."

If salaries are drawn by officers and office assistants, why are not the petitions of these guardians recognized and considered and their work commended?

With due credit to Dr. Gulick for launching a "Girls' Scout" movement, it is yet most unfair to enlist the free, altruistic and splendid services of women to develop this work and give them no voice in the matter of correction of administration.

A QUEENSBORO GUARDIAN.  
 New York, March 10, 1915.

## The Conning Tower

## THE GRAND TOUR

## LOS ANGELES.

Pronounced, according to a line flying from the Times's masthead, Loe Ahng-hay-lis. Only it isn't. Most of the inmates call it Loss Ang'glass.

There was a Los Angeles man on the train into San Francisco. He forced a conversation, or begged tacitly, rather, for permission to do a monologue. We were riding past some snow-tipped mountains in Nevada. "Don't see much snow where I live," he began. Doubtless he noticed the haggardness of my face, denoting sleeplessness. Equally doubtless he guessed that I had been tossing about all night wondering whether he saw much snow where he lived. So he decided to assure me. "Nope," he repeated, caressing his thought, "don't see much snow down where I live." "No?" I asked, chivalrously, yet without simulating fascination. "Well, I should say not," he said, as who should say "How dare you suggest that where I live we have a lot of snow, you poor provincial Easterner?" "Don't believe I've seen snow on the ground since I've lived in Law Zanjeleez. It's a mighty interesting town. Ever been there?" There is such a thing, I find, as carrying the Tribune's "First to Last—the Truth" banner too far. I told him no. That was his music cue.

"I've been practically all over the world," he rhapsodized, "and Law Zanjeleez has got 'em all beat. If you're out here to write articles about the expositions, you'll find more interesting things in Law Zanjeleez than at either of the fairs. Got 407 miles of asphalt roads in the county. Smooth's a billiard table. Biggest town in the state, you know. Got Frisco beat for size, though the census figures is about it. Give us 319,000 in 1910. Matter of fact we got at least 600,000. If you're a newspaper reporter I guess you're interested in those things. Anybody'd be. Can't beat our hotels. The Alexandria, the finest hotel in the world. At Pasadena, about eight miles out—it's practically a part of Law Zanjeleez—there'll be men there in the season representing over eighty billions of dollars. Men who can go anywhere they want to, too. Pick up Law Zanjeleez out of the whole world. Mighty interesting. Interested in moving pictures? Don't overlook the fact that ninety per cent of the moving picture films are made right near there. It's mighty interesting. We get the films there in town about a week to ten days before they get 'em in the East. I saw 'The Clansman' the other night. First time was shown. Lots of actors around Law Zanjeleez. I had Dunstun [sic] Farm pointed out to me the other day. Mighty interesting. Never met him, but a fraction of mine knows him pretty well. Mighty interesting, yes. You want to see our athletic club, too. Finest in the world. Got 2,500 members. I suppose you've heard about our climate. It's the most equable in the world. I never have to wear an overcoat in the daytime, winter or summer; and I have to sleep under blankets winter and summer. Great stunt here we let San Diego and Frisco give these fairs. We get all the business and have none of the expense. Get 'em going and coming, so to speak. . . . Anything you want to know about that town, ask me."

"Do you know," I asked, "where Charlie Van Loan lives?"

"Van Loan? What's his line?"

"He's a writer."

"No. What does he write for?"

"The Saturday Evening Post, Collier's, the Popular Magazine."

"Funny, I never noticed his name."

"Doesn't Harry Leon Wilson live in that part of the country?"

"I don't know. What does he do?"

"He's a writer, too. He wrote 'Ruggles of Red Gap.'"

"I don't know. I read a lot—great reader—but I never notice who writes the stories."

And so on—an hour of straight "information."

Next morning he came again to my section. He gave me another compendium of "interesting" facts. "What body of water is this?" I asked, as we came along San Francisco Bay. "I don't know," he admitted. "I've only been west four years. Used to live in Detroit, but Law Zanjeleez is the place to live."

In Ring Lardner's first "Letters of a Bushier" Jimmy Callahan and Jack Keel were riding on the ferry from Oakland.

"Maybe when I'm pitching," Jack said, "Cobb won't get on base." "Yes," said Callahan, "and maybe San Francisco Bay is made of grape-juice."

Friend Ring, I suppose you been wondering what it was made of grape-juice. Well, Ring, I got a good look at it and it ain't made out of no grape-juice Ring. But I bet it is better to drink than the Call grape-juice I bet on the train. I will give these here native sons a show. I says, so I ordered a split of Calif. grape juice and I checked like bum salad dressing and on the stand they put Wines, life and if I put that in my expense a/c I bet Mr. Rogers would think well he been drinking whiskey or a cocktail but honest Ring it was a split of grape-juice and I would druther have a magnum of San Francisco Bay. Believe me Ring.

The man who proofread the Los Angeles telephone book must have been admiring the climate when he came to Van Loan's name. One doesn't find it. "Information," using the same book, doesn't find it. But she knows who Charley is—and you him.

Tomorrow: "A Day with a Fiction Slave."

P. P. A.